



1652

OCT 21 2002

TRANSMITTAL LETTER
(General - Patent Pending)Docket No.
112843-006

The application Of: Maurer et al.

Serial No.
09/674,738Filing Date
July 25, 2001Examiner
M. WalickaGroup Art Unit
1652

Title:

USE OF BROMELAINE PROTEASES FOR INHIBITING BLOOD COAGULATION

RECEIVED

OCT 23 2002

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

TO THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

Transmitted herewith is:

Response to Restriction Requirement
Return Receipt Postcard

in the above identified application.

No additional fee is required.

A check in the amount of _____ is attached.

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge and credit Deposit Account No. 02-1818 as described below. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Charge the amount of _____

Credit any overpayment.

Charge any additional fee required.

Dated: October 15, 2002

Signature

Robert M. Barrett (30,142)
ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANTS
Bell, Boyd & Lloyd LLC
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

CC:

I certify that this document and fee is being deposited on 10/15/2002 with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail under 37 C.F.R. 1.8 and is addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231

Robert J. Buccieri

Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence



RECEIVED

OCT 23 2002

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

14/jew
10.28.02

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Maurer et al.
Appl. No.: 09/674,738
Filed: July 25, 2001
Title: USE OF BROMELAINE PROTEASES FOR INHIBITING BLOOD COAGULATION
Art Unit: 1652
Examiner: M. Walicka
Docket No.: 112843-006

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Sir:

Please enter the following response in the above-identified patent application.

REMARKS

This response is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on September 24, 2002. The Office Action requires Applicants to elect a single invention to which the claims allegedly must be restricted. In this regard, Applicants are to elect between nine apparent groups of alleged invention.

Applicants do not believe this restriction requirement is proper either as a matter of fact or law. The restriction requirement does not appear to be between specific claims, rather parts of the claims.

Indeed, the Patent Office has not stated which claims relate to which group of invention; for example, Claim 4 is not even mentioned in the Office Action. Thus, Applicants do not believe the requirement is proper and therefore Applicants respectfully request that it be withdrawn.